



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,005	12/10/2003	William G. Reeves	17,988	9405
2356                      7590                      10/30/2009 KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE, INC. Tara Pohlkotte 401 NORTH LAKE STREET NEENAH, WI 54956				
			EXAMINER	
			LIGHTFOOT, ELENA TSOY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2009                      PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

10/734,005

## Applicant(s)

REEVES ET AL.

## Examiner

Elena Tsoy Lightfoot

## Art Unit

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 14, 15 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 14, 15 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

Amendment filed on August 14, 2009 has been entered. Claims 12, 14, 15, and 23 are pending in the application.

***Claim Objections***

1. Objection to claims 16 and 18 because of the informality has been withdrawn due to cancellation of the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Rejection of claims 12, 14, 15, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reeves et al (US 6376011) in view of Tsubakimoto et al (US 4,734,478) has been withdrawn due to amendment.

Note that the recitation of “in view of Tsubakimoto et al” is an *inadvertent error* that occurred during the word processing of a new Office Action.

4. Claims 12, 14, 15, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reeves et al (US 6376011), as applied in the previous Office Action, and further in view of Hansen (US 5807364).

As discussed previously, Reeves et al teaches that a mixture of water and a *synthetic adhesive* such as polyvinyl alcohol may be used as an association agent (See column 9, lines 11-17) to achieve an intimate association (claimed crosslinking) of the coating material with the superabsorbent material via *mechanical and/or chemical bonding* (See column 8, lines 34-60).

The selection of a particular association agent can be made by one skilled in the art and will typically depend upon the chemical composition of the materials to be maintained in intimate association with one another, and desirably, the association agent should be non-toxic and non-irritating to humans to be suitable for use in applications involving human contact (See column 8, lines 61+).

Reeves et al fails to teach claimed crosslinking reagent for the use as a *synthetic adhesive* instead of polyvinyl alcohol (Claim 12).

However, Hansen teaches binders such as **protonated** primary, secondary or **tertiary amines** (claimed quarternary amine) or deprotonated quarternary ammonium salts are suitable for binding *superabsorbent* particles to *cellulose* fibers by interacting ionically with functional groups on superabsorbent particles or cellulose fibers (See column 5, lines 46-58) to provide the particle-fiber bond of sufficient strength to withstand the usual handling that a particle-containing fibrous web undergoes during transportation and during reprocessing for use in a finished product (See column 5, lines 1-8) such as diapers and sanitary napkins (See column 10, lines 16-20).

It is held that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a prima facie obviousness determination in *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945). See MPEP 2144.07.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used protonated tertiary amines as a synthetic adhesive in Reeves et al instead of polyvinyl alcohol with the expectation of providing the desired bonding of superabsorbent particles and cellulose fibers of sufficient strength to withstand the usual

handling, as taught by Hansen, since Reeves et al does not limit a synthetic adhesive to particular compounds.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12, 14, 15, and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elena Tsoy Lightfoot whose telephone number is 571-272-1429. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1792

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Elena Tsoy Lightfoot, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1792

October 30, 2009

/Elena Tsoy Lightfoot/